DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 149 JC 750 582

AUTHOR Wyman, Bruce T.
TITLE Certain Strategies for Prison Classes Sponsored by Community Colleges.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 75
NOTE 49p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University. Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Correctional Education; *Junior Colleges; Learning Theories; Practicums; *Prisoners; Questionnaires; Student Attitudes; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

In order to examine the success of various teaching methods on community college students currently incarcerated in Delaware County Prison, Kings County Prison, and Leesburg State Prison, a questionnaire was designed and administered to student inmates and their instructors, who were faculty members of three different community colleges in the Philadelphia area. Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which instructors used various teaching strategies and techniques representing either the behaviorist or the cognitive field theories of learning. Students were also asked to indicate which of the various strategies they felt would work well or poorly for themselves. There was a slight preference for the cognitive field approach, but the students were not clearly receptive to either approach, as both approaches received some favorable and some unfavorable reactions. Cognitive field techniques that received at least 60 percent favorable reaction include: concern with ideas, choice of activities, and emphasis on knowing reasons for misunderstood concepts. Behaviorist techniques that received favorable scores include: clarity of purpose and curriculum design, rewards, repetition, and short answer tests. A survey of the literature is included, and data are displayed in tables. The survey instrument is appended. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED114149

CERTAIN STRATEGIES FOR PRISON CLASSES SPONSORED BY COMMUNITY COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Bruce T. Wyman, M.A.

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION.

NOVA UNIVERSITY

October 1, 1975

JC 750 582

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express his sincere appreciation to Willie R. Carter, Dr. George Walker, Cornelius Stewart and Russell Gray for their assistance in gathering the data for this paper. Also, the various institutions who cooperated in the research: Broadmeadows, Kings County Prison and Leesburg State Prison have my deep gratitude.

It would be remiss of me not to say a big thank you to Ms. M. Elizabeth Grandizio for the typing and processing of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
INTRODUCTION		1
BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE		2
SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE		5
DEFINITION OF TERMS		13
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY		14
BASIC ASSUMPTIONS		15
PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA		16
PROCEDURES FOR TREATING DATA		17
	BROADMEADOWS	18
	KINGS COUNTY PRISON	20
	LEESBURG STATE PRISON	22
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS		24
RESIDUAL FINDINGS AND QUESTIONS RAISED		27
BIBLIOGRAPHY		29
APPENDIX A:	Cover letter sent to faculty teaching inmate courses to accompany the questionnaire.	i
APPENDIX B:	Questionnaire and instructions for same.	ii
APPENDIX C:	TABLES	
	Validation of Stated Theoretical Position of Items by Professional Evaluators.	iv
	Faculty and Mean Student Evaluation of Faculty Member for Course Taught at Broadmeadows.	v

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	PAGE
Mean Student Evaluation of Effectiveness for Own Selves of Teaching Strategies and Techniques at Broadmeadows, by Percentage	vi
Faculty and Mean Student Evaluation of Faculty Member for Course Taught at Kings County Prison	vii
Mean Student Inmate Evaluation of Effectiveness for Own Selves of Teaching Strategies and Techniques at Kings County Prison, by Percentage	viii
Faculty and Mean Student Evaluation of Faculty Member for Course Taught at Leesburg State Prison	ix
Mean Student Inmate Evaluation of Effectiveness for Own Selves of Teaching Strategies and Techniques at Leesburg State Prison, by Percentage	x
Total Mean Student Evaluation of Effectiveness for Own Selves of Teaching Strategies and Techniques at Three Incarcerating Institutions, by Percentage	xi

INTRODUCTION

Delaware County Community College, as part of its community service program, is involved with offering a few courses, sporatically, to the inmates at the Delaware County Prison, more commonly called "Broadmeadows." Those few courses offered to date appear to have been well received, but the College feels that much more can be done in this area. The Dean of Instruction -- Continuing Education and Non-Traditional Studies, Eugene J. Kray, and an instructor currently offering a Human Relations Laboratory at Broadmeadows, Assistant Professor Michael Capuzzi, have both stated the need to better determine successful teaching strategies and techniques for prison inmate courses.

The purpose of this study is to examine the teaching methods, as perceived by the inmates, which are more and less successful. Three separate community colleges, each offering courses in a prison or prisons in their own area will be asked to conduct a survey of their prison inmates' preferences in classroom strategies and techniques. It will then, hopefully, be possible to draw up some specific recommendations concerning certain strategies and techniques which should be incorporated in future prison course offerings. It is the author's expectation that methods recommended for use inside the prison walls will not differ from those regularly used in typical community college course work when teaching students from disadvantaged neighborhoods with limited academic achievement, the so-called "Non-Traditional Student."

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Delaware County Community College is a co-educational, public, two year institution located in a densely populated urban-suburban county bordering on Philadelphia. The College has an enrollment of approximately 3,000 full- and part-time students. It offers regular day and evening programs at its main campus and three off-campus centers. In addition, it provides educational opportunities to some 7,000 persons per year through its community service programs, often carrying out the programs at diverse locations convenient to the enrollees. Two such type programs have been held at Sleighton Farms For Girls, a private minimum security detention center for teen-age girls and Broadmeadows.

Broadmeadows, or Delaware County Prison as it is officially named, is a minimum security institution for men in one cluster of buildings and a medium security center for women in another. There are several hundred men detained there at any given time, but only about fifty or sixty women. By statute unable to mix these two groups, the College has offered community service courses to some inmates of each gender, separately.

Broadmeadows, as its colloquial name implies, is located away from the center of the county's population, on rolling farm land. Indeed, it has also at times been called a prison farm for certain of the inmates operate the farm which grows much of the prison foodstuffs. The prison also offers vocational experiences but is not too progressive in this area in this author's

opinion and therefore this cannot be referred to as "vocational rehabilitation." The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is not recognized as a leader in prison rehabilitation and reform (it is ranked about 40th in the states in several comparison studies) and Broadmeadows is typical of the Pennsylvania institutions.

Some citizens of Delaware County have become actively concerned about the conditions at Broadmeadows. They attend the monthly Prison Board Meetings, visit with the Warden and his representatives and lobby in Harrisburg, the state capitol and Media, the county seat, attempting to improve prison life. They have initiated some changes and it can safely be stated that without their paving the way, the College would have had a much more difficult time in gaining permission to offer such courses as it has presented. Never-the-less, the various instructors who have taught these have reflected considerable resistance and "red-tape" from many directions.

One of the greatest difficulties is to be found in the nature of the population. Roughly sixty percent of the inmates incarcerated at Broadmeadows are awaiting trial, as they have been unable to raise the appropriate bail. Many, therefore, are resentful, convinced that they will be found innocent or receive such a light sentence that they will need to serve no further time. Trial backlogs often mean a six-month delay, although this is improving considerably in the last year or two.

Most of the courses offered by the College to date at the prison deal with coming to grips with oneself. Who am I? What do I want in life? How can I relate better to myself and others?, and the like. At the female center, one such course used grooming as a medium for these goals. At the men's, they have tended to simply be referred to as human relations seminars. Some basic English work has been done, also. It is obvious that much more needs to be accomplished. It is hoped that this study will point some ways to reach this end.

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

There are special problems attendant to any institution by their very nature. Prisons perhaps have more special problems than most other institutions. Broadmeadows certainly has its share. Sixty percent of this minimum security prison's inmates are awaiting trials. Stearns (15) points out that a real difficulty in offering viable course work at the "County Jail Level" is the "brevity of sentencing." Inmates are constantly moving in and out of Broadmeadows, making consistancy of course work most demanding. Stearns continues by stating that there is a definite "U-Shaped relationship between level of anxiety and time in jail." That is to say, there is a high level of anxiety at both the beginning and the end of the incarcerating period. Prison personnel, in general, and college course faculty, in particular, cannot work with the inmate as well at these times as in the middle of his stay. This is especially true of inmates facing a trial at the end of his stay as opposed to facing release. Stearns does suggest that if one is able to develop a feeling of trust in the inmate during the middle of his stay, he may be able to work with him through to the end. Some other problems that Stearns discusses also apply to Broadmeadows: disruptions caused by transitional or "migrating" prisoners who only spend a few days or weeks; logistics -- many regulations dictate who can mix with whom, for instance non-sentenced inmates may not be legally permitted to mix with inmates who have been sentenced (except for religious services); and, perhaps most distressing, the limited space available for counselling and educational course work. Stearns suggests that the use of a cell block as a sort of school

dormatory has been tried with "surprising results" to the good. Class size should range from five to fifteen, he adds.

Watkins, in "Changing Inmate Behavior," (17) describes several problems in penal institutions that effect trying to change behavior in people who are incarcerated against their will. The greatest, he feels, is that this enforced confinement produces a special kind of criminal subculture which contains three separate types. He labels these types as the "adapters" or those people who come into the institution with very little experience in living in jails, college youth who are caught using "pot" and who are really just a special king of "adapter" and the "solids" or those who teach the new people the special ways of the subculture. The way to break through to the individual inmate, Watkins claims, is "1) have personal contact with him, 2) build up his trust and 3) help him out in a tough situation." Having been a teacher in such a situation, the author must remind the reader that this last statement is fraught with difficulty. One may well find that helping one inmate loses another -- or worse, can break down rapport with the prison staff.

In his article, "The Moral Atmosphere of the Prison," Scharf (12) suggests another specific difficulty -- which is a part of the aforementioned inmate subculture. "The more primitive moral reasoning used in the prison....may be related to inmate perceptions of the moral atmosphere of the prison" and that "the traditional custodial prison fails to offer the inmate conditions necessary to move him toward higher stages of thinking." Scharf feels that in order to

substantially effect the inmate's moral reasoning, communities (Stearn's cell dormatories?) must be provided that stimulate his moral thinking and are perceived by him as fair.

Sinclair and Moulden (15) point out three problems that also apply to the inmates at Broadmeadows. These are "1) lack of programs to prepare inmates for socially constructive roles in the community, 2) job discrimination against former inmates and 3) the poverty background of many inmates." On the other hand, these authors point out that while inmates are severely handicapped according to traditional academic measures, "in terms of the current movement in education towards individualized instruction nowhere is there a more fertile ground for receptive students" than prison inmates.

Schwitzgebel (13) states a similar thought as this last relation to behavior modification in that since behavior modification focuses on behavior and since most offenses of inmates involves observable behavior, "these techniques are remarkably well-suited" for integration into the system. He also notes the tremendous vagueness and inconsistencies of the statutory standards and that use of such techniques as behavior modification must incorporate protecting the individual offender's personal rights.

Many differing programs in various prisons have been written up. As in Theories of Psychology, each claims that its particular program is more successful than most. McKee and Seay opt for Individually Prescribed Instruction

(IPI). They state that

> I.P.I. can be quite successful if this system users:
> 1. Learn the underlying theoretical principles of I.P.I.
> 2. Recognize the benefits of I.P.I.
> 3. Recognize that I.P.I. has limitations.
> 4. Involve the trainee in planning and operating the system.
> 5. Relate basic educational skills as closely as possible to occupational goals and work.
> 6. Use small instructional units or modules.
> 7. Employ paraprofessionals to assist in the training system. (9)

In a separate paper, McKee (8) discusses the development and application of Contingency Management, which incorporates I.P.I., at the Draper Correctional Center in Georgia. He defines Contingency Management (C.M.) as "systematic arrangement of reinforcing consequences of behavior." He points out that the Draper inmate population -- and this is largely true of the Broadmeadows population, as well -- makes up the lowest rung of the motivational ladder. They have been "turned-off" by public education which has "always dealt them constant failure and rebuff." This, of course, results in real hostility and leads to a desire to avoid any contact with the educational process. Not only this, but "they have failed in every major undertaking in their lives -- even crime!" Since these inmates are success-deprived, they continue to seek reinforcers, McKee maintains, in those areas where they have been punished, including education, authority figures and family. He reports on six separate studies which show that the materials and techniques of "C.M. ....that have been successfully employed" fall into two categories: the contingency or performance contract and the use of progress plotters. Results of these studies, he claims, clearly indicate that performance-contingent-pay to trainees is significantly superior in

getting efficient and effective learning in both basic educational and vocational programs. In the Draper project with I.P.I., for instance, the reinforcers used were largely social approval from the staff, their fellows and from visitors. In another study, visible daily charts and actual monetary rewards were used and a marked increase in productivity was demonstrated.

In their "Phase II. Final Report" on the studies mentioned above, The Rehabilitation Research Foundation summarized their findings:

> Some (successful) highlights of the overall program are: 1) open entry/exit feature of vocational training with an emphasis on individuation, 2) the basic education delivery system (Individually Prescribed Instruction System), 3) techniques of behavioral control employed in the token economy, 4) techniques of behavioral science taught to traditional correctional officers, 5) techniques of the contingency management system.... (11)

Wood and Jenkin (18) suggest employing the more educationally advanced inmates as one-to-one basic education tutors for inmate students (shades of the old one-room school house technique; the more things change the more they stay the same!). They recommend "Precision Teaching" wherein a verbal response and interpersonal contact is required. They state that such Precision Teaching was shown to generate higher rates of correct response emission on criterion tests than was generated by the use of just a teaching machine, and that even the use of a teaching machine produced higher scores than using the text book alone.

"Bibliotherapy" or group reading and discussion is espoused by Burt (1) for those inmates that can read, comprehend and wish to participate. He feels

that the group discussion form of bibliotherapy may supplement the correctional program by improving attitudes related to the behavioral for all groups participating, by additionally improving attitudes related to persons, for certain groups, and that when the sessions are conducted by faculty working with quite small groups. Interestingly enough, he states that an analysis of the various interactions showed that those who had served more time, had the most time to serve and/or were Black were affected more positively than their fellow inmates.

In spite of all the special difficulties cited earlier in this paper, and the various special applications of generally used techniques mentioned just above, it is this author's contention that the classroom techniques for correctional institutional inmates need not differ from those many community colleges are currently using in their own classrooms for the educationally disadvantaged. Several studies in the last few years support this contention. For example, Johnson (6) did a study of self-esteem and related background factors for recently admitted reformatory inmates in which he found no significant differences between the new prisoner and the typical citizen. He suggests that there is a slight correlation between inmate background and inmate self-esteem, but "not to have more than (the) slightest influence."

Using Spearman's rank correlation to compare reading interests of college students and inmates in two separate tests, Corneli (2) found that within the range of the materials used for his study, there was no significant difference in the reading interests of these two groups. Entin and Nosin (4), using

a one-try-success condition, found that prisoners high in achievement motivation but low in test anxiety performed significantly better than those low in achievement motivation but high in test anxiety in a non-contingency path but not in a contingency path, whereas students did significantly better in both paths. The differences between the students and the prisoners was not too great, however, leading Corneli to state that there may be "some indications that prisoners tend to behave (more) as if they were failure threatened," but that further research was needed before this conclusion could be substantiated.

Seibold and Steinfatt (14) correlated cooperative game techniques with "degree of dogmatism." There is a general belief that prisoners tend to have a greater degree of authoritative personality aspects than the general public. Comparing a selected prison group with four selected college groups, they found that the percentage of cooperative responses were similar in both groupd, however. They further found that while the "low-dogmatic" pairs in both groups (inmates and college students) tended to behave much the same, the "high-dogmatic" pairs in the prison group tended to play even more cooperatively than in the college samples.

Cross discusses the "Non-Traditional Student" in her book Beyond The Open Door. She lists their attributes as follows:

1. More women than men.
2. A different learning orientation than the traditional student.
3. Likely to spend leisure time in non-academic pursuits.
4. Activities are low skill in nature.

5. Drift into vocation rather than choose it.
6. Have more negative attitudes toward school (although not necessarily towards teachers).
7. Have not been expected to assume any responsibility for own learning.
8. Express greatest interest in activities not usually stressed in academics.
9. Score in lower 1/3 of typical achievement tests.
10. Coming back to school after a long period -- have made own choice to do so and, initially at least, have high motivation.
11. Likely, poorly informed about career and occupation option.
12. Generally, wants to get a better job as soon as possible -- not interested in degrees -- just job.
13. Great dissatisfaction with major decisions they have made in past and this strongly colors self-image.
14. Usually have considerable fear of conventional tests.
15. Regardless of Standardized Test Scores, they are probably not below average intelligence.
16. Often scarred by bad past experiences in past learning settings.
17. At least 1/4 will disappear if placed immediately into traditional programs.
18. Need much more frequent reinforcement than traditional.
19. Nor usually seeking 2nd chance, more likely a 3rd, 4th, or even Nth chance.
20. Do not come in with much interest in transferring.

(3)

All in all, there does not seem to be that great a difference between the non-traditional college student needing remedial or developmental course work and the prison inmate. They both tend to have some feelings of failure and the resulting frustrations towards education. They both appear to have the same reading interests, similar degrees of dogmatism and feelings (or lack of) self-esteem. They both need constant personal, individual attention, positive feedback or reinforcement, small class size and both have relatively short attention spans necessitating a step-by-step program. It is the intent of this study to verify whether this is true.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to provide a meaningful understanding of terms in this paper, the following definitions have been utilized:

1. Faculty - all members of a community college faculty who have academic rank and who are not listed as part of the administration, i.e. those normally referred to as the "teaching faculty."

2. Learning - "The process by which an activity originates or is changed through reacting to an encountered situation, provided that the characteristics of the change in activity cannot be explained on the basis of native response tendencies, maturation or temporary states of the organism" - Hilgard and Bower (5).

3. Non-Traditional Student - "One who scores in the bottom third in typical academic testing" - P. Cross (3).

4. Prison - For the purposes of this study, any incarcerating institution.

5. Prison Inmate - any individual incarcerated against his will in a prison, whether before or after his sentencing.

6. Students - all members of a community college's student body currently enrolled with either regular or special status.

7. Teaching Strategy - the overlying philosophical approach a faculty member uses to put across his desired teaching, e.g. behavior modification.

8. Teaching Technique - the specific mode a faculty member uses to impart a specific learning objective, e.g. probability.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In any study there occurs a series of variables which cannot be controlled; this study is no exception. The following limitations are hereby noted:

1. Three different community colleges are involved in this study. Each has its own policies and procedures which cannot always be taken into account.

2. Only inmates currently enrolled in community college courses and currently in the prison environment will be surveyed. This not only severely limits the sample, but also means that no randomness can be employed.

3. State regulations and impact on both the community colleges and the prisons vary among the states.

4. Teaching strategies and techniques will vary among the various faculty members involved.

5. The levels of expected achievement may well vary greatly for the different prison classes surveyed. The questionnaire was constructed without knowledge of the levels of courses in the sample. It is intended to be generic - but may be interpreted differently by the various students.

6. Personal qualities of the faculty cannot be fully taken into account.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

All research projects, whether statistical or descriptive, must involve several assumptions. The following will be made for the purposes of this study:

1. That responses made by the various students and inmates completing the survey document will be accurate and honest.

2. That the inmate sample selected will demonstrate typicality for inmates enrolled in community college sponsored courses.

3. That the community colleges involved, at least from a global standpoint, have similar organizational and policy structures.

4. That the prison institutions involved, again from a global standpoint, have similar organizational and policy structures, except where specific exceptions are noted.

5. That the concepts employed in the survey are relevent to the concepts being judged.

6. That despite the restrictions involved in obtaining the separate samples of the three prison institutions, there is no significant differences in the survey responses due to the policy structures of level of academic course work.

7. That homogeneity of variance is operative despite the limitations in sample selection and size.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

1. Three community colleges represented by the Nova University Philadelphia Cluster that offer courses to prison inmates were requested to administer a survey (See Appendix B) to the inmates enrolled in such courses. A cover letter (See Appendix A) to the faculty members involved was included. These surveys were distributed to the appropriate faculty the first week in May, with completed surveys requested to be mailed back by May 15, 1975. However data collection proved to be much more difficult than anticipated, therefore not all of the surveys were returned until the middle of September.

2. The various faculty were asked to administer these surveys to their inmate classes anonymously, and to respect the confidentiality of same. The faculty took the same survey themselves.

3. The survey sought to determine the inmate students' perceptions of the instructor's general strategy: behaviorist or cognitive field theory, and also of some of the techniques the instructor used, e.g. token economy, or Socratic inquiry. Further, the survey sought the students' preferences in terms of which approaches they felt would work best for them personally.

4. Residually, the faculty teaching the course were asked to take the survey, also. A comparison of faculty and student perceptions could then be derived.

PROCEDURES FOR TREATING DATA

The survey was first submitted to a panel of twelve professional educators drawn from both the Philadelphia Cluster of Nova University enrolled in the "Learning Theory and Applications Module" and members of the psychology and counseling staff at Delaware County Community College asking them to state which theory of learning each item represented, in their professional opinion. This was done to ensure that the items on the survey did indeed represent the learning theory (either cognitive field or behaviorist) this author claimed. All items received at least the minimal eighty percent criterion for acceptance: two had 83.3 percent agreement, one had 91.7 percent, the balance all received one hundred percent endorsement. (See Appendix C, Table I)

Since the three separate penal institutions involved differ significantly in mission and the types of courses surveyed also vary, the date is most easily handled in a modified mini-case-study mode. Therefore, each institution's responses will be summarized separately, delineating which types of classroom strategies and techniques are seen as more, and less, successful in the eyes of the inmates.

BROADMEADOWS

Broadmeadows, or Delaware County Prison as it is officially named, has been described earlier. It remains, for descriptive purposes, only to state that the inmates surveyed were enrolled in a basic English course taught by a self-styled "behaviorist" full time member of the Communications and Humanities staff at Delaware County Community College. Using the rating of "Not At All" equalling zero up to "usually" equalling five on the survey (see Appendix B for items), this instructor rated himself as averaging 1.60 on all cognitive items and 3.80 on all behaviorist (the "reward" items of the behaviorist school getting the lowest ratings in that school).

The students, however, did not see such a dramatic distinction, collectively rating him 2.66 on all cognitive items and 3.15 on all behaviorist items. Interestingly, when the students were asked which of the teaching strategies and techniques they felt would be most effective for themselves personally, there appeared a distinct preference for the cognitive-field approach. Seventy-four percent of the cognitive statements received favorable checkmarks indicating that "this approach would work for me," sixteen percent were greeted unfavorably indicating "this approach would not work for me," and ten percent were indicated as having no strong reception either way. The behaviorist items, in the same order, scored fifty-six percent favorable, thirty-three percent unfavorable and eleven percent no opinion.

Individual items that went against the general pattern tended to be in the behaviorist approach, with one notable exception: forty-four percent were unfavorable to the cognitive teaching strategy that "Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives." Items receiving strong student support in the behaviorist school included "A lot of short answer type tests," "Introducing new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it," "Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right" (What inmate does not want extra privileges?), "Helps us learn by giving over and over the same things 'til we get them right" and "rewards us when we get things right." (See Appendix C, Tables II and III)

KINGS COUNTY PRISON

Kings County Prison has many of the same problems that Broadmeadows does, it has rapid turnover, many inmates are awaiting trial and remain convinced of their innocence and has statutory restrictions on mixing specific types of inmates. However, this is an urban county, and, therefore, the prison occupies much less open space giving the inmates a much greater feeling of being shut in.

The inmates at Kings County who were surveyed were enrolled in a course in human relations -- a sort of "Who Am I" course; therefore, the goals of both the inmates and the instructor are quite different than those at the Broadmeadows' basic English course. This instructor is a full time staff member of LaGuardia Community College on Long Island, New York. The instructor appears to be quite eclectic: he rated himself exactly the same on all cognitive field and behaviorist items -- a 3.40 average again using the scale of zero to five as described previously. The students perceived him the same way: 3.81 on all cognitive items and 3.79 on all behaviorist.

It would appear that the inmates at Kings County Prison are not enthralled with either learning theory approach. The cognitive items collectively were rated by these students on the question of would this method work for you as forty-three percent favorable, forty-eight percent unfavorable and nine percent no opinion. The two notable exceptions were that sixty-

seven percent felt the item "Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer" favorably and sixty percent said the same on the item "Suggests activities, but tried to let us choose which ones we would like to do." Three were very unpopular: "Wants us to discover things for ourselves," "Is always asking us what we are interested in," and "Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives."

The Behaviorist approach fared even worse in student ratings concerning what they felt would work for themselves personally. The collective averages were thirty-five percent favorable, fifty-nine percent unfavorable and five percent no opinion. No behaviorist item could be interpreted as meeting general support. Five were met with great resistance. These items dealt with memorizing answers, grades based on "right" or "wrong" answers, a lot of short answer type tests, gaining extra privileges for getting work done right (it is hard to believe that these inmates reject any method of getting extra privileges!) and going over and over the material until they have "got it right."

Most of the items were met with very mixed responses: half or so would like that approach, the other definitely would not. Eleven of the twenty items evoked this divisive sort of reception. For a complete breakdown of the Kings County Prison inmates responses see Appendix C, Tables IV and V.

LEESBURG STATE PRISON

Leesburg State Prison is an entirely different type of incarcerating institution. Virtually all of the inmates have been sentenced, many for long stays. It is much larger with more complex problems. It is divided into many segments. Three small classes were surveyed, one from each of the medium security unit, the minimum security unit and the study release program. In the medium unit, the men have quite limited freedom, classes are held in their own block. Eight of these inmates participated in the survey. The minimum unit is much freer. The men live in barracks, have quite a bit of freedom to roam around and attend classes at the prison school. Only eight of these participated also. In the study release program, eleven men took the survey. These men are allowed to leave the prison each day to attend classes at the Glassboro State College campus with the other students at the College, returning to the College each night.

The particular course that was surveyed is the same for all three groups, is taught by the same instructor at the prison and is designed to help the inmates to "come more in contact with themselves," who they are and how to adjust back to the outside world when they get out. Presumably, therefore, this course is offered toward the end of their incarceration. Because it is the same course, is taught by the same instructor in roughly the same way for all three groups and has such small enrollments in each section, it seemed logical to lump their responses together. Statistically, as well

as can be computed with such small samples, there is no significant differences in the responses between any two of these classes.

The instructor is a full time professor at Glassboro State College. He rates himself as somewhat cognitive field in approach with a 3.10 average on those items; whereas his own rating on behaviorism is only 2.40. The students do not see such a definite distinction, they rate him on all cognitive items as 2.63 and 2.32 on the behaviorist statements.

The students are quite eclectic in strategies in techniques preferred for "working (or not) for myself." The cognitive items received a fifty-eight percent favorable, thirty-five percent unfavorable and seven percent no opinion evaluation; the behaviorist percentages in the same order were fifty, forty-two and eight. There were only two popular items, one from each school. The cognitive statement receiving very favorable rating (seventy-four percent) was the one dealing with more concern with ideas than with right answers; the behaviorist approach of leaving a lot of short answer type tests was also well received (sixty-three percent). The only clearly unpopular item was behaviorist, sixty-seven percent rejected the use of workbooks. (See Appendix C, Tables VI and VII)

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In such a limited student it is difficult to draw hard and fast conclusions, much more study would need to be done before one could clearly and definitively state that incarcerated students prefer such and such a teaching strategy or technique. Only tentative suggestions can be made at this point. Nevertheless, some approaches to teaching struck these particular students as being quite effective for themselves, other approaches had mixed reactions and a few were clearly disliked. With full knowledge of the limitations of the study, the following comments are therefore given.

The inmates are not clearly receptive to either school as both received some favorable and some quite unfavorable reactions. The students were asked to:

> place a plus sign (+) next to those things the instructor might do that you feel would be most helpful for you personally and a minus sign (-) next to those that you feel would not work very well with you. Leave blank any items that you are not sure whether they would work well for you personally or not.

The cognitive school results were slightly more favorable: fifty-nine percent favorable, thirty-three percent unfavorable and eight percent no strong opinion. The behaviorist items collectively scored forty-eight percent no strong opinion. There is not a statistically significant difference in these scores. The students would appear to prefer an eclectic approach by their instructors.

The following cognitive field teaching strategies and techniques received at least sixty percent favorable reaction and, therefore, might be considered as well suited to the incarcerated inmate classroom: "Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right ideas" (76%), "Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do" (67%) and "Wants us to ask 'why?' if we do not understand something" (67%). Others scoring fairly high were: "Asks what we would like to do next" (57%), "Is always asking us what we are interested in" (55%), "Wants us to discover things for ourselves" (55%) and "Is always asking us 'Why did you say that?'" (53%).

Some behaviorist teaching strategies and techniques also gained favorable scores and, therefore, should be considered for use in such classes: "Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doint it" (66%), "Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right" (60%) and "Rewards us when we get things right (60%). Also scoring quite well was "Gives a lot of short answer type tests" (57%).

Only two approaches were strongly disapproved with a third quite close behind: "Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers" (78%), "Grades are based on 'right or wrong' answers" (64%) and "Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions" (59%). It is interesting to note that all three of these are in the behaviorist school and relate specific, fre-

quently memorized or exact answers. It would seem that these three should be discarded from inmate classrooms unless most careful consideration dictated this was the only way the data can be covered effectively by the instructor.

The balance of the items earned "mixed reviews" (see Appendix C, Table VIII for all scores). It would appear that these approaches might be used, knowing students will give them varied reception, only after thoughtful reflection of the desired goals and other alternative approaches have been discarded.

RESIDUAL FINDINGS AND QUESTIONS RAISED

The faculty were asked to rate themselves on the same items as the students had rated them. There was remarkable agreement in direction in all three cases, though the degree differed in each case, still using the zero ("Not at all") to five ("Usually") scale:

RATING OF FACULTY IN INMATE CLASSES BY THEORY OF LEARNING APPROACH-ALL ITEMS

	STUDENT RATING		FACULTY RATING	
	BEH.	COG.	BEH.	COG.
Broadmeadows	3.15	2.66	3.80	1.60
Kings County Prison	3.79	3.81	3.40	3.40
Leesburg State Prison	2.32	2.63	2.40	3.10

Leesburg State Prison and Kings County Prison ratings are also quite close in terms of instructor-self and student score differentials. The Broadmeadows' students saw the instructor as only slightly behaviorist whereas the instructor saw himself as decidedly so. Further study would be needed to determine if the faculty member himself actually instructs the way he feels he does.

One other thought occurs in perusing the data. There is a slight tendency for the students to lean away from the school that the particular faculty member represents in both the Leesburg and Broadmeadows cases. The Kings County situation appears right down the middle and therefore is immaterial

in this issue. Are the student preferences for some teaching strategies and techniques over others colored by their affinity for the instructor using them? Would these same students have rated personal choices differently if they had been in a different instructor's course? Do these slight tendencies instead reflect a general dissatisfaction with the inmates' current environment, incarceration? Such questions as these deserve further and deeper research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Burt, L. N. "Bibliotherapy: Effect of Group Reading And Discussion on Attitudes of Adult Inmates in Two Correctional Institutions, Final Report." (Madison: Wisconsin University, 1973).

2. Corneli, H. McG. "A Comparison of the Reading Interests of Prisoners and College Students." (Ann Arbor, Mich: University Microfilms, 1973).

3. Entin, E. E. & Nosin, J. "Performance of Prisoners in Two Kinds of Contingency Paths." (Athens, Ga: Department of Offender Rehabilitation, 1975).

4. Cross, K.P. Beyond The Open Door. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971).

5. Hilgard, E.R. & Bower, G.H. Theories of Learning. (3rd ed.) (N.Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966).

6. Johnson, R.E. "A Study of the Self-Esteem and Related Background Factors of New Reformatory Inmates." (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968).

7. Lippitt, R., Fox, R. & Schmuck, R. "Innovating Classroom Practices To Support Achievement Motivation and Ego Development." Behavioral Science Frontiers in Education. Bower, E.M. & Hollister, W.G., eds. (N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967).

8. McKee, J. M. "The Use of Contingency Management to Effect Learning Performance in Adult Institutionalized Offenders." (ERIC, 1971.) ED 057 299.

9. McKee, J.M. & Seay, D.M. "The Use of Individually Precribed Instruction for the Disadvantaged". (ERIC, 1972) ED 059 432.

10. Miller, J. Teacher Evaluation. (N.Y.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).

11. "The Experimental Manpower Laboratory For Corrections: Phase II, Final Report." (Elmore, Ala: Rehabilitation Research Foundation 1972).

12. Scharf, Peter. "The Moral Atmosphere of the Prison" (ERIC, 1971.) ED 078 311.

13. Schwitzgebel, R.K. "Development and Legal Regulations of Coercive Behavior Modification Techniques with Offenders." (Wash., D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

14. Seibold, D.R. & Steinfatt, T.M. "Prisoner's Dogmatism Scores and Creative Game Behavior Under Full Communication and Real Reward Conditions: A Correlation Study." (ERIC 1974.) ED 084 581.

15. Sinclair, W. & Moulden, W.E. "Educating Prisoners for Socially Constructive Roles." (Wash., D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974).

16. Stearns, J.D. "Rehabilitation at the County Jail Level: A Model Program." (Lansing: Michigan State Department of Education, 1971).

17. Watkins, John C. "Changing Inmate Behavior." (Elmore, Ala: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1970).

18. Wood, L.F. & Jenkin, W.O. "Imprisoned Resources -- Innovative Techniques in Educating Prison Inmates." (Elmore, Ala: Rehabilitation Research Foundation, 1971).

APPENDIX A

Dear Instructor:

I need your help! I am in an Ed.D. program at Nova University along with your colleague who gave you this. As part of my course work for Educational theory and Applications, I am doing a paper on inmates taking courses sponsored by community college and offered inside the incarcerating institution. The ultimate goal would be to arrive at teaching strategies and techniques that are most effective in that environment. I cannot hope to do that in this project. Therefore, I am limiting myself to these students' perceptions of your methods and whether they feel these perceived methods work for them.

To this end, I am asking you to have your students take this enclosed questionnaire, anonymously. I would also ask that you take the same questionnaire--and label it "instructor" to differentiate from the students. Also, it would be helpful if you could pencil in what the course is and what the level of the course is (e.g. basic English or English Composition). As noted in the enclosed directions--which for simplicity's sake I am asking you to read to them and to make any further explanations necessary--the students are to go through the questionnaire twice. You are asked only to take it the first way. (You might well want to glance over the students' responses to see how closely they relate to your own.)

If you can possibly see your way to doing this, I would appreciate it greatly. Thank you!!

When you have the completed questionnaires, please return them to the colleague that gave them to you in the first place.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce T. Wyman

Bruce T. Wyman
Delaware County Community College
Media, Pa. 19063 (215)353-5400 ext. 269

/as

Enclosure: Questionnaires
Instructions for the questionnaire

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS

(Introduce the questionnaire in the most appropriate way for your class--the levels of the different classes being survey range too great for one style introduction.)

I. For each of the items on the questionnaire, check column on the right which you feel is most true of your instructor. Only use the "Don't know" column if there's no other appropriate response you can possibly make.

(When they have all finished, then --)

II. OK, now please go back and go through it again. This time, to the left of each item in the margin, place a plus sign (+) next to those things the instructor might do that you feel would be most helpful for you personally and a minus sign (-) next to those that you feel would not work very well with you. Leave blank any items that you are not sure whether they would work well for you personally or not.

The way I see it, my instructor:	Not At All	Seldom	Occasionally	Sometimes	Frequently	Usually	Don't Know
. Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.							
. Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.							
. Gives a lot of short answer type tests.							
. Wants to develop creative thinking.							
. Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.							
. Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it?							
7. Is always asking us "Why did you say that?"							
. Tells us what we will do next.							
. Asks us what we would like to do next.							
. Tries to get me to think about, "Who I Am?"							
. Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.							
. Wants us to discover things for ourselves.							
. Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.							
. Is always asking us what we are interested in.							
5. Helps us learn by going over and over the same things til we get them right.							
6. Talks about learning as changes in our behavior. (Such as spelling a word right)							
7. Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.							
8. Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.							
9. Rewards us when we get things right							
0. Wants us to ask "why?" if we do not understand something							

APPENDIX C

TABLES

TABLE I

VALIDATION OF STATED THEORETICAL POSITION
OF ITEMS BY PROFESSIONAL EVALUATORS

	Theoretical Position Stated	Percent Agreement
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	C.-F.	100
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	Beh.	100
Gives a lot of short answer type tests.	Beh.	100
Wants to develop creative thinking.	C.-F.	100
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	Beh.	100
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	Beh.	83.3
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	C.-F.	100
Tells us what we will do next.	Beh.	83.3
Asks us what we would like to do next.	C.-F.	100
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	C.-F.	100
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	Beh.	100
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	C.-F.	100
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	Beh.	91.7
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	C.-F.	100
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	Beh.	100
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	Beh.	100
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	C.-F.	100
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	C.-F.	100
Rewards us when we get things right.	Beh.	100
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	C.-F.	100

1. C.-F. means Cognitive-Field Theory of Learning, Beh. means Behaviorist Theory of Learning.

N=12

TABLE II

FACULTY AND MEAN STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBER FOR COURSE TAUGHT AT BROADMEADOWS

	Learning Theory Represented	Faculty Member Self Rating	Mean Student Rating of Faculty Member
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	C.-F.	3	4.12
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	Beh.	5	2.47
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	Beh.	5	3.69
Wants to develop creative thinking.	C.-F.	2	4.59
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	Beh.	5	2.59
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	Beh.	4	4.06
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	C.-F.	1	1.94
Tells us what we will do next.	Beh.	4	4.24
Asks us what we would like to do next.	C.-F.	0	1.06
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	C.-F.	0	1.47
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	Beh.	3	1.12
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	C.-F.	4	3.31
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	Beh.	3	3.82
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	C.-F.	3	2.00
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	Beh.	4	3.00
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	Beh.	1	2.33
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	C.-F.	1	2.76
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	C.-F.	0	1.00
Rewards us when we get things right.	Beh.	4	4.18
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	C.-F.	3	4.35
	$\bar{X}$ C.-F.	1.60	2.66
	$\bar{X}$ Beh.	3.80	3.15
			N=16

TABLE III

MEAN STUDENT EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR OWN SELVES OF TEACHING STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES AT BROADMEADOWS, BY PERCENTAGE

	Helpful For Self	Not Sure If Helpful	Would not Be Helpful
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	87.5	0.0	12.5
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	37.5	6.3	56.3
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	68.8	18.8	12.5
Wants to develop creative thinking.	93.8	6.3	0.0
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	18.8	12.5	68.8
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	81.3	6.3	12.5
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	62.5	18.8	18.8
Tells us what we will do next.	62.5	12.5	25.0
Asks us what we would like to do next.	68.8	12.5	18.8
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	68.8	12.5	18.8
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	12.5	0.0	87.5
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	75.0	12.5	12.5
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	68.8	12.5	18.8
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	62.5	18.8	18.8
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	75.0	0.0	25.0
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	43.8	43.8	12.5
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	81.3	12.5	6.3
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	50.0	6.3	43.8
Rewards us when we get things right.	87.5	0.0	12.5
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	93.8	0.0	6.3

N=16

TABLE IV

FACULTY AND MEAN STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBER FOR COURSE TAUGHT AT KINGS COUNTY PRISON

	1. Learning Theory Represented	2. Faculty Member Self Rating	2. Mean Student Rating of Faculty Member
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	C.-F.	4	3.50
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	Beh.	4	3.73
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	Beh.	4	3.58
Wants to develop creative thinking.	C.-F.	4	3.85
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	Beh.	2	3.31
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	Beh.	4	4.08
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	C.-F.	4	3.43
Tells us what we will do next.	Beh.	4	3.85
Asks us what we would like to do next.	C.-F.	4	3.93
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	C.-F.	2	3.67
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	Beh.	4	3.80
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	C.-F.	4	4.00
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	Beh.	4	4.26
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	C.-F.	2	4.13
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	Beh.	2	3.92
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	Beh.	4	3.57
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	C.-F.	4	4.00
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	C.-F.	4	3.85
Rewards us when we get things right.	Beh.	2	3.86
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	C.-F.	2	3.71
	$\bar{X}$ C.-F.	3.40	3.81
	$\bar{X}$ Beh.	3.40	3.79

1. C.-F means Cognitive-Field, Beh. means Behaviorist Theory of Learning.

2. Rating derived by: Not at all = 0, Seldom = 1, Occasionally = 2, Sometimes = 3, Frequently = 4, and Usually = 5.

N=15

TABLE V

MEAN STUDENT INMATE EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR OWN SELVES OF TEACHING STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES AT KINGS COUNTY PRISON, BY PERCENTAGE

	Helpful For Self	Not Sure If Helpful	Would Not Be Helpful
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	66.7	0.0	33.3
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	53.3	0.0	46.7
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	33.3	0.0	66.7
Wants to develop creative thinking.	33.3	6.7	60.0
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	40.0	0.0	60.0
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	40.0	0.0	60.0
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	40.0	13.3	46.7
Tells us what we will do next.	33.3	13.3	53.3
Asks us what we would like to do next.	46.7	13.3	40.0
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	40.0	13.3	46.7
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	26.7	6.7	66.7
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	20.0	6.7	73.3
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	20.0	13.3	66.7
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	26.7	13.3	60.0
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	26.7	6.7	66.7
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	40.0	6.7	53.3
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	60.0	6.7	33.3
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	60.0	6.7	33.3
Rewards us when we get things right.	40.0	6.7	53.3
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	33.3	13.3	53.3

N=15

TABLE VI

FACULTY AND MEAN STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBER FOR COURSE TAUGHT AT LEESBURG STATE PRISON

	1. Learning Theory Represented	2. Faculty Member Self Rating	2. Mean Student Rating of Faculty Member
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	C.-F.	5	2.59
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	Beh.	0	2.26
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	Beh.	3	1.82
Wants to develop creative thinking.	C.-F.	5	3.40
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	Beh.	1	3.18
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	Beh.	4	2.58
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	C.-F.	3	2.55
Tells us what we will do next.	Beh.	5	3.47
Asks us what we would like to do next.	C.-F.	2	1.82
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	C.-F.	1	2.63
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	Beh.	0	2.43
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	C.-F.	2	3.45
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	Beh.	3	1.33
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	C.-F.	2	1.82
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	Beh.	4	2.67
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	Beh.	1	2.12
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	C.-F.	5	1.82
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	C.-F.	1	2.15
Rewards us when we get things right.	Beh.	3	1.36
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	C.-F.	5	4.07
	$\bar{X}$ C.-F.	3.1	2.63
	$\bar{X}$ Beh.	2.4	2.32
			N=27

1. C.-F. means Cognitive-Field, Beh. means Behavioral Theory of Learning.

2. Rating derived by Not at all =), Seldom = 1, Occasionally = 2, Sometimes = 3, Frequently = 4 and Usually = 5.

TABLE VII

MEAN STUDENT INMATE EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR OWN SELVES OF TEACHING STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES AT LEESBURG STATE PRISON, BY PERCENTAGE

	Helpful For Self	Not Sure If Helpful	Would Not Be Helpful
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	74.1	3.7	22.2
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	25.9	7.4	66.7
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	63.0	7.4	29.6
Wants to develop creative thinking.	37.0	7.4	55.6
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	25.9	11.1	63.0
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	70.4	7.4	22.2
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	55.6	11.1	33.3
Tells us what we will do next.	59.3	3.7	37.0
Asks us what we would like to do next.	55.3	11.1	33.3
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	51.9	7.4	40.7
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	18.5	3.7	77.8
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	63.0	7.4	29.6
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	59.3	3.7	37.0
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	66.7	0.0	33.3
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	70.4	7.4	22.2
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	55.3	14.8	29.6
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	63.0	7.4	29.6
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	44.4	7.4	48.1
Rewards us when we get things right.	55.3	11.1	33.3
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	70.4	3.7	25.9

N=27

TABLE VIII

TOTAL MEAN STUDENT EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR OWN SELVES OF TEACHING STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES AT THREE INCARCERATING INSTITUTIONS, BY PERCENTAGE

	Helpful For Self	Not Sure If Helpful	Would Not Be Helpful
Is more concerned about my ideas than whether I give the right answer.	75.9	1.7	22.4
Stresses use of a workbook that asks very specific questions.	36.2	5.2	58.6
Gives a lot of short answer type tests	56.9	8.6	34.9
Wants to develop creative thinking.	51.7	13.8	41.4
Grades are based on "right or wrong" answers.	27.6	8.6	63.8
Introduces new topics by telling us exactly what he wants us to do and how we are to go about doing it.	65.5	5.2	29.3
Is always asking us, "Why did you say that?"	53.4	13.8	32.8
Tells us what we will do next.	53.4	8.6	37.9
Asks us what we would like to do next.	56.9	20.7	31.0
Tries to get me to think about, "Who I am."	53.4	10.3	60.3
Places a lot of emphasis on memorizing answers.	19.0	3.4	77.6
Wants us to discover things for ourselves.	55.2	8.6	36.2
Gives us extra privileges if we get all our work done and done right.	51.7	8.6	39.7
Is always asking us what we are interested in.	55.2	8.6	36.2
Helps us learn by going over and over the same things 'til we get them right.	60.3	5.2	34.5
Talks about learning as changes in our behavior (Such as spelling a work right).	48.3	20.7	31.0
Suggests activities, but tries to let us choose which ones we would like to do.	67.2	8.6	24.1
Tries to get us to decide what we want to do with our lives.	50.0	6.9	43.1
Rewards us when we get things right.	60.3	6.9	32.8
Wants us to ask "Why?" if we do not understand something.	67.2	5.2	27.6

N=58

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 19 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES